



**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

FILED

02-28-08

04:59 PM

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Implement the)
Commission's Procurement Incentive Framework)
And to Examine the Integration of Greenhouse Gas)
Emissions Standards into Procurement Policies)

Rulemaking 06-04-009
(Filed April 13, 2006)

**ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of: Order Instituting)
Informational Proceeding on a)
Greenhouse Gas Emissions Cap)

Docket 07-OIIP-01

**COMMENTS OF THE MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
ON INTERIM OPINION ON GREENHOUSE GAS
REGULATORY STRATEGIES**

Joy A. Warren
Modesto Irrigation District
1231 11th Street
Modesto, CA 95354
Tel: (209) 526-7389
Fax: (209) 526-7383
Email: joyw@mid.org

February 28, 2008

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Implement the)
Commission's Procurement Incentive Framework)
And to Examine the Integration of Greenhouse Gas)
Emissions Standards into Procurement Policies)

Rulemaking 06-04-009
(Filed April 13, 2006)

**ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of: Order Instituting)
Informational Proceeding on a)
Greenhouse Gas Emissions Cap)

Docket 07-OIIP-01

**COMMENTS OF THE MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
ON INTERIM OPINION ON GREENHOUSE GAS
REGULATORY STRATEGIES**

In accordance with Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC") of the State of California, the Modesto Irrigation District ("Modesto ID") hereby files these Comments ("Comments") on the proposed "Interim Opinion on Greenhouse Gas Regulatory Strategies" issued February 8, 2008 (the "Proposed Decision" or "PD"). Modesto ID also files these Comments with the California Energy Commission ("CEC") in Docket 07-OIIP-01. In these Comments, the CPUC and CEC will collectively be called the "Joint Agencies."

Modesto ID has several concerns with the point of regulation proposals outlined in the PD, and believes significant clarifications must be provided before a final recommendation is adopted by the CPUC. Modesto ID also disagrees with the PD's approach regarding energy efficiency and renewable resources which exceeds the objectives of AB 32 and is founded on blatant fallacies. The PD's recommendations must be carefully structured to ensure that

compliance with AB 32 is achieved without devastating California's electric providers or the customers they serve.

I. BACKGROUND.

Modesto ID is an irrigation district, organized and operated under the laws of the State of California, which undertakes both electric and water operations. It is a vertically integrated publicly owned utility providing electric services to over 114,000 customers in California's Central Valley. With regard to its electric operations, Modesto ID owns and operates facilities for the generation, transmission, distribution, purchase and sale of electric power and energy at wholesale and retail. Modesto ID is a fully integrated, fully resourced, credit worthy utility. In 2007 Modesto ID served a peak summer load of almost 675 MW and had retail sales of over 2,572 GW-hours.

Modesto ID serves this load through a mixture of owned and purchased resources, including wind, large and small hydro, natural gas and coal generation. In addition to ownership interests in significant hydroelectric generation at Don Pedro Reservoir, Modesto ID owns several natural gas generation facilities. Modesto ID purchases power from a variety of resources and suppliers, including renewable resources firmed by the supplier. These purchases are delivered within MID's service territory, and outside of its service territory at various points both within and out of state. Modesto ID is also a member of a joint powers authority, the M-S-R Public Power Agency ("M-S-R"), which purchases power from wind energy projects in the Pacific Northwest and owns a share of the thermal San Juan Project in New Mexico. M-S-R annually produces about 1,750 GW-hours of energy of which about 35% (605 GW-hours) would be classified as eligible renewable.

Modesto ID currently projects its annual average load growth over the next ten (10) years to be 2.79 percent. Modesto ID is located in the central San Joaquin Valley where population

growth has been consistently higher than the State average. The forecast growth is consistent with Modesto ID's historical load growth which has averaged 3% over the last 25 years.

II. THE POINT OF REGULATION APPROACH SUBMITTED TO CARB MUST PROVIDE MECHANISMS TO ACHIEVE COMPLIANCE WITH AB 32 WITH THE LEAST IMPACT TO RATEPAYERS.

Pursuant to AB 32 the California Air Resources Board (CARB) is responsible for implementing the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction goals set forth in that legislation. CARB has thus undertaken a scoping plan process to determine what mechanisms will be most effective in achieving these goals with the least cost and impact to ratepayers. The Joint Agencies have been tasked with developing and providing CARB with recommendations on how best to meet this objective within the electric and gas sectors. The PD presents the CPUC's recommendations regarding "point of regulation" to CARB.

A. CLARIFICATION IS REQUIRED BEFORE THE FIRST DELIVERER POINT OF REGULATION CAN BE IMPLEMENTED.

The PD determines that the point of regulation for the electric sector, which is the entity that will be required to surrender allowances associated with GHG emissions attributed to it, should be the party responsible for the power at the point where it is first delivered to the California grid, and concludes:

"the most useful formulation of the deliverer point of regulation approach is that the point of regulation would be the entity that is responsible for the electricity either (1) on the portion of the physical scheduling path where it is first delivered to a point of delivery on the transmission grid within California or (2) where the generator's facilities are interconnected to the distribution system in California."

(PD, pp.65-66.)

The PD does not explore the plethora of intricate arrangements by which power may be brought onto the California grid. Several fundamental questions have yet to be addressed. For

example, how will “the entity that is responsible for the electricity” at any point in time be determined? What impact will this approach have on pre-existing contractual terms? Will the proposed approach be consistent with E-tag procedures as they are currently operated? Will the necessary information to appropriately determine the “first deliverer” be available from E-tag data? What form of “alternative documentation” will be required where E-tag data is not available? How will these situations be identified? What process will be undertaken to develop and provide oversight of such “alternative documentation”?

The CPUC will need to fine tune its proposal and answer these and other questions before adopting the PD. In doing so, the CPUC must ensure that the mechanism it proposes for identifying the entities responsible for GHG reductions identifies those entities best able to minimize cost of compliance and impact on California ratepayers.

B. CALIFORNIA REGULATIONS CANNOT REGULATE ELECTRICITY THAT IS NEITHER GENERATED NOR CONSUMED IN CALIFORNIA.

The PD properly notes that AB 32 governs GHG emissions from electricity generated or consumed in California. It recognizes that California GHG emission reduction regulations cannot reach beyond California to emissions generated and consumed outside of California, even where a California electricity provider may have an ownership share in the generating resource. “AB 32 would not regulate emissions associated with power wheeled through California.” (PD, p. 66, n 17.) Thus, the point of regulation incorporated into any scoping plan developed by CARB must allow for the distinction between emissions associated with power generated or consumed within California from those associated with power that is neither generated nor consumed in California. The reporting regulations ultimately by CARB for approval must also recognize such distinction and be consistent with the point of regulation approach adopted.

III. POUS CANNOT BE MADE SUBJECT TO MANDATES DESIGNED AND IMPOSED BY THE CPUC.

The PD expends much effort justifying its recommendation that CARB impose energy efficiency and renewable portfolio mandates on publicly owned utilities (POUs) “the same as those required of investor owned utilities (IOUs) by the [CPUC].” (PD, OP 1-3.) Putting aside the lack of any legal foundation for such regulation, special mandates for POUs are not necessary. Nor do they make good policy.

A. POUS ARE SUBJECT TO AND COMPLY WITH OR EXCEED THE MANDATES OF EXISTING ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE PORTFOLIO LEGISLATION.

New, additional, special mandates on POUs are not needed to accomplish the goals of AB 32. First, POUs are already subject to the energy efficiency and renewable resource requirements set forth by the Legislature, including those in AB 2021, SB 1068 and SB 107 cited by the PD. (PD, Conclusion of Law 1-3.) For example, the popularly elected Board of Directors of the Modesto ID has adopted both energy efficiency goals that are designed to achieve feasible and realizable reductions in energy consumption, and a renewable procurement standard that meets the requirements set forth by the Legislature. In both cases, Modesto ID’s programs are targeted to achieve results on par with those energy efficiency and renewable procurement results achieved by IOUs regulated by the CPUC. For example, recent testimony before the legislature confirmed that POUs as a whole maintain over 20% renewables in their resource portfolios, exceeding current IOU performance.

Nor is it good policy to impose regulatory decisions adopted by the CPUC on POUs that are not CPUC jurisdictional. The PD’s recommendations are only a thinly veiled effort to overcome the CPUC’s well-recognized jurisdictional constraints, more focused on creating what the IOUs perceive to be a “level playing field” than on achieving real additional GHG

reductions. As noted below, such recommendations also exceed the purpose and authority set forth in AB 32. AB 32 is not about creating competitive equality between IOUs and POUs; it is about achieving real reductions in GHG emissions.

The PD is factually incorrect and misleading when it presumes that applying the CPUC rules to POUs will create “a level playing field.” Even without seeking the necessary clarification of what constitutes a “level playing field” the fallacies on which the PD bases its assumptions are clearly identifiable. POUs were created by the legislature under specific, well thought out, statutory constructs. The various governing structures of POUs and IOUs have been the subject of thorough exploration in other CPUC proceedings – it is well documented that POUs do not operate under the same circumstances as IOUs. (See, eg., Decision (D.) 07-12-005)

By Constitution and statute, POUs are not CPUC jurisdictional, and are not subject to or regulated by the decisions of the CPUC. As such, the POUs did not actively participate in or otherwise have any influential role in the proceedings that produced the regulatory mandates the CPUC would now have applied to the POUs. History has shown that even in proceedings the POUs do actively participate in before the CPUC, their perspective is given very little weight or recognition.

Moreover, as specifically related to the energy efficiency and renewable resources, applying the mandates adopted in CPUC decisions for IOUs to all POUs would not put all utilities on equal footing but rather would give IOUs which receive monetary “incentives” for partially meeting established goals, advantages not available to POUs who have no mechanism for similar incentives. In addition, POUs do not generally enjoy the market power, economies of scale and breadth of customer base experienced by the IOUs and program measures that may be effective for the larger IOUs could likely be detrimental to POU ratepayers.

Moreover, before recommending that its regulatory mandates should be universally adopted, the CPUC must overcome evidence that such mandates cannot be achieved in today's economy. For example, the PD recommends that POUs be required to adopt energy efficiency goals that "achieve all cost-effective energy efficiency." Yet, there is no evidence that even the IOUs are approaching compliance with such goals.

The level of GHG emission reductions to be achieved by 2020 are dictated by the goals set forth in AB 32. In order to achieve such reductions utilities need the flexibility to determine the balance of available tools most effective for their own particular circumstances. For some, more energy efficiency reductions are available; for others a heavier investment in renewable resources may be required. As noted above, every utility is situated differently and the most cost effective mix of compliance mechanisms must be judged by each utility in accordance with its own circumstances. The 2007 California Integrated Energy Policy Report noted that the state's inland areas such as the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys are growing at a rate that is disproportionally higher than the rest of the state. These areas are also hotter than the milder heavily populated coastal areas and as a result require more air conditioning, which in turn causes higher peak loads with lower load factors. The ability to factor in these and other variables such as changing load type makeup, fluxuating industrial requirements, peak patterns, proximity to resources, and transmission capabilities are even more critical for POUs which are smaller and have significantly smaller customer base that will be required to absorb the costs and impacts of emission reduction activities.

B. CARB DOES NOT HAVE AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE CPUC MANDATES ON POUS IN THE GUISE OF GHG REDUCTION REGULATIONS.

AB 32 does not contain legislative direction or authority for CARB to regulate the specifics of POU energy efficiency programs or renewable resource procurements. Energy

efficiency and renewable resource procurement are individual elements that without question will be the primary tools used by entities with reduction responsibilities to meet the AB 32 goals. However, energy efficiency and renewable resource standards are already established by separate laws, laws presumed to have been carefully crafted and considered by the Legislature that adopted them. Those laws already determine the POU's obligations in the establishment of energy efficiency programs and renewable resource portfolios. As noted above Modesto ID, like other POUs, are meeting or exceeding those obligations.

If the CPUC does adopt recommendation for CARB regulation of POUs, such recommendation must incorporate an approach that treats all electric providers equally. Thus, if CARB were to accept oversight of energy efficiency and renewable resource mandates it must do so for *all* utilities – IOUs as well as POUs - and must develop its own regulations for such oversight independently from existing CPUC decisions and mandates. Regardless, any new mandates must be designed to provide sufficient planning time for compliance.

IV. ANY CAP/TRADE SYSTEM MUST BE IMPLEMENTED IN A MANNER TO ENSURE MARKET STABILITY.

Implementation of AB 32 must avoid any repeat of the electric industry restructuring debacle. The market must be designed to develop gradually and ensure that the appropriate safety valves and fraud prevention elements are in place. Market manipulation must be precluded. A neutral source of oversight must also be clearly identified and empowered. Modesto ID believes that flexible compliance options are critical to the success of any market system and that the “toolbox” approach is the most important aspect of such flexibility. Energy efficiency and renewable resources are two of the most important tools available to entities responsible for GHG emission reductions. However, once ultimate reduction goals are established each entity must have flexibility to apply these and other available tools at its

discretion so long as the reduction mandates are met. Modesto ID also appreciates the PD's recognition that offsets, banking, borrowing, and other tools should also be options to be included in program "toolbox."

V. ALLOWANCE ALLOCATION ISSUES ARE PROPERLY SEGREGATED TO SEPARATE DECISION.

The PD appropriately postpones all aspects of emission allowance allocation. Until critical aspects of CARB's scoping plan are developed the effect and impact of various allocation recommendations cannot be fully identified. This point of regulation decision cannot predetermine any of the important allowance allocation issues raised by the numerous parties in previous filings in this proceeding. Additional workshops and/or hearings will be required to gather evidence necessary to address these issues, including the recognition of early reduction activities and "early actions" as they may eventually be defined, electrification of emission from other sectors, disproportionate reduction burdens, high load growth, etc.

Modesto ID generally recommends that if a market based system is implemented to meet emission reduction goals, emission allowances should be allocated administratively based at least initially on point of regulations' historic emissions and accounting for forecasted as well as mandated load growth. Auction of allowances should be minimized and delayed until a robust market has matured. Proceeds from any allowance allocation should be applied for the benefit of the ratepayers and used to reduce emissions, including investments in research and development of new non-emitting generation, renewable energy resources, and programs to encourage energy efficiency. Any market system put in place must be closely monitored by an identifiable regulatory body to avoid manipulation, fraud and other abuses.

VI. ALL GAS USED BY INTEGRATED ELECTRIC UTILITIES SHOULD BE REGULATED THROUGH THE ELECTRIC SECTOR REQUIREMENTS.

The PD rightly excludes from regulation under the natural gas sector any emissions that would be regulated through other sectors. Thus, the PD appropriately exempts from regulation as part of the natural gas sector, with a few specific exceptions, all natural gas that is used to generate electricity that is delivered to the California grid. (PD, p. 97.) In order to avoid double-counting concerns and the excessive burden of multiple reporting and compliance requirements, it must be clear that entities responsible for emissions regulated through the electric sector mandates are not also responsible for emissions regulated through the gas sector.

VII. CONCLUSION.

Modesto ID appreciates the opportunity to review its concerns regarding the PD and urges the CPUC to clarify its intent regarding the first deliverer point of regulation and to remove its recommendations to impose the CPUC energy efficiency and renewable requirements on POUs. The point of regulation approach adopted by the CPUC must provide mechanisms to achieve compliance with AB 32 in the most cost effective manner and avoid unnecessary impact to ratepayers. In formulating its recommendations the CPUC must ensure that new GHG requirements are consistent with and coalesce seamlessly into the existing body of related laws and regulations. Further, the CPUC should not overreach its boundaries to force superfluous regulation on to POUs.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Joy A. Warren

Joy A. Warren
Regulatory Administrator
Modesto Irrigation District
joyw@mid.org

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Linda Fischer, certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

On February 28, 2008, I served the attached:

COMMENTS OF THE MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT ON INTERIM OPINION ON GREENHOUSE GAS REGULATORY STRATEGIES

on the service list for R.06-04-009 by serving a copy of each party by electronic mail, or by mailing a properly addressed copy by first-class mail with postage prepaid to each party unable to accept service by electronic mail.

Copies were also sent by first-class mail with postage prepaid to Commissioner Peevey and Administrative Law Judges Charlotte F. TerKeurst and Jonathan Lakritz.

A copy was also sent by first-class mail with postage prepaid to the California Energy Commission, Docket Office, MS-4, Re: Docket No. 07-OIIP-01, 1516 Ninth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-5512.

Copies were also served by email to the CEC docket office and to Nancy Ryan, Commissioner Peevey's advisor.

A copy of the service list is attached hereto.

Executed on February 28, 2008, at Modesto, California.

/s/ Linda Fischer

Linda Fischer

SERVICE LIST

R.06-04-009

cadams@covantaenergy.com
 steven.schleimer@barclayscapital.com
 steven.huhman@morganstanley.com
 rick_noger@praxair.com
 keith.mccrea@sablaw.com
 ajkatz@mwe.com
 ckrukpa@mwe.com
 kyle_boudreaux@fpl.com
 cswoollums@midamerican.com
 Cynthia.A.Fonner@constellation.com
 kevin.boudreaux@calpine.com
 trdill@westernhubs.com
 ej_wright@oxy.com
 todil@mckennalong.com
 steve.koerner@elpaso.com
 jenine.schenk@apses.com
 jbw@slwplc.com
 kelly.barr@srpnet.com
 rrtaylor@srpnet.com
 smichel@westernresources.org
 roger.montgomery@swgas.com
 Lorraine.Paskett@ladwp.com
 ron.deaton@ladwp.com
 snewsom@semprautilities.com
 dhuard@manatt.com
 curtis.kebler@gs.com
 dehling@klng.com
 gregory.koiser@constellation.com
 npedersen@hanmor.com
 mmazur@3phasesRenewables.com
 vitality.lee@aes.com
 tiffany.rau@bp.com
 klatt@energyattorney.com
 rhelgeson@scppa.org
 douglass@energyattorney.com
 pssed@adelphia.net
 bwallerstein@aqmd.gov
 akbar.jazayeri@sce.com
 cathy.karlstad@sce.com
 Laura.Genao@sce.com
 rkmoore@gswater.com
 dwood8@cox.net
 atrial@sempra.com
 apak@sempraglobal.com
 dhecht@sempratrading.com
 daking@sempra.com
 svongdeuane@semprasolutions.com
 troberts@sempra.com
 liddell@energyattorney.com
 marcie.milner@shell.com
 rwinthrop@pilotpowergroup.com

tdarton@pilotpowergroup.com
 lschavrien@semprautilities.com
 GloriaB@anzaelectric.org
 llund@commerceenergy.com
 thunt@cecmail.org
 jeanne.sole@sfgov.org
 john.hughes@sce.com
 llorenz@semprautilities.com
 marcel@turn.org
 nsuetake@turn.org
 dil@cpuc.ca.gov
 fjs@cpuc.ca.gov
 ahang@nrdc.org
 rsa@a-klaw.com
 ek@a-klaw.com
 kgrenfell@nrdc.org
 mpa@a-klaw.com
 sis@a-klaw.com
 bill.chen@constellation.com
 epoole@adplaw.com
 agrimaldi@mckennalong.com
 bcragg@goodinmacbride.com
 jsqueri@gmsr.com
 jarmstrong@goodinmacbride.com
 kbowen@winston.com
 lcottle@winston.com
 mday@goodinmacbride.com
 sbeatty@cwclaw.com
 vprabhakaran@goodinmacbride.com
 jkarp@winston.com
 edwardoneill@dw.com
 jeffgray@dw.com
 cjw5@pge.com
 ssmyers@att.net
 lars@resource-solutions.org
 alho@pge.com
 bkc7@pge.com
 aweller@sel.com
 jchamberlin@strategicenergy.com
 beth@beth411.com
 kerry.hattevik@mirant.com
 kowalewska@calpine.com
 hoerner@redefiningprogress.org
 janill.richards@doj.ca.gov
 cchen@ucusa.org
 gmorris@emf.net
 tomb@crossborderenergy.com
 kinnovation@earthlink.net
 bmcc@mccarthy.com
 sberlin@mccarthy.com
 Mike@alpinenaturalgas.com

joyw@mid.org
 bdcapo@caiso.com
 UHelman@caiso.com
 jjensen@kirkwood.com
 mary.lynn@constellation.com
 lrdevanna-rf@cleanenergysystems.com
 abb@eslawfirm.com
 mclaughlin@braunlegal.com
 glw@eslawfirm.com
 jluckhardt@downeybrand.com
 jdh@eslawfirm.com
 vwelch@environmentaldefense.org
 www@eslawfirm.com
 westgas@aol.com
 scohn@smud.org
 atowbridge@daycartermurphy.com
 dansvec@hdo.net
 notice@psrec.coop
 cynthia.schultz@pacificcorp.com
 kyle.l.davis@pacificcorp.com
 ryan.flynn@pacificcorp.com
 carter@ieta.org
 jason.dubchak@niskags.com
 bjones@mjbbradley.com
 kcolburn@sympioticstrategies.com
 rapcowart@aol.com
 Kathryn.Wig@nrgenergy.com
 sasteriadis@apx.com
 george.hopley@barcap.com
 ez@pointcarbon.com
 burtraw@rff.org
 vb@pointcarbon.com
 andrew.bradford@constellation.com
 gbarch@knowledgeinenergy.com
 ralph.dennis@constellation.com
 smindel@knowledgeinenergy.com
 brabe@umich.edu
 bpotts@foley.com
 james.keating@bp.com
 jimross@r-c-s-inc.com
 ahendrickson@commerceenergy.com
 cweddington@commerceenergy.com
 tcarlson@reliant.com
 ghinners@reliant.com
 zaiontj@bp.com
 julie.martin@bp.com
 fiji.george@elpaso.com
 echiang@elementmarkets.com
 fstern@summitblue.com
 nenbar@energy-insights.com
 nlenssen@energy-insights.com

bbaker@summitblue.com
 william.tomlinson@elpaso.com
 kjsimonsen@ems-ca.com
 jholtkamp@hollandhart.com
 Sandra.ely@state.nm.us
 bmcquown@reliant.com
 dbrooks@nevp.com
 anita.hart@swgas.com
 randy.sable@swgas.com
 bill.schrand@swgas.com
 jj.prucnal@swgas.com
 sandra.carolina@swgas.com
 ckmittchell1@sbcglobal.net
 chilen@sppc.com
 emello@sppc.com
 dsoyars@sppc.com
 tdillard@sppc.com
 jgreco@terra-genpower.com
 leilani.johnson@ladwp.com
 randy.howard@ladwp.com
 Robert.Rozanski@ladwp.com
 robert.pettinato@ladwp.com
 HYao@SempraUtilities.com
 rprince@semprautilities.com
 rkeen@manatt.com
 nwhang@manatt.com
 pjazayeri@stroock.com
 derek@climaterestory.org
 david@nemtzw.com
 harveyederpspc.org@hotmail.com
 sendo@ci.pasadena.ca.us
 slins@ci.glendale.ca.us
 THAMILTON5@CHARTER.NET
 bjeider@ci.burbank.ca.us
 rmorillo@ci.burbank.ca.us
 aimee.barnes@ecosecurities.com
 case.admin@sce.com
 Jairam.gopal@sce.com
 tim.hemig@nrgenergy.com
 bjl@bry.com
 aldyn.hoekstra@paceglobal.com
 ygross@sempraglobal.com
 jlaun@apogee.net
 kmkiener@fox.net
 scottanders@sandiego.edu
 jkloberdanz@semprautilities.com
 andrew.mcallister@energycenter.org
 jennifer.porter@energycenter.org
 sephra.ninow@energycenter.org
 dnierhaus@semprautilities.com
 jleslie@luce.com

ofoote@hkcf-law.com
 ekgrubaug@iid.com
 mona@landsiteinc.net
 pepper@cleanpowermarkets.com
 gsmith@adamsbroadwell.com
 mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com
 Diane_Fellman@fpl.com
 hayley@turn.org
 mflorio@turn.org
 Dan.adler@calcef.org
 mhyams@sfwater.org
 tburke@sfwater.org
 norman.furuta@navy.mil
 amber@ethree.com
 annabelle.malins@fco.gov.uk
 dwang@nrdr.org
 filings@a-klaw.com
 nes@a-klaw.com
 obystrom@cera.com
 sdhilton@stoel.com
 scarter@nrdr.org
 abonds@thelen.com
 brbc@pge.com
 cbaskette@enernoc.com
 colin.petheram@att.com
 jwmctarnaghan@duanemorris.com
 kfox@wsgr.com
 kkhoja@thelenreid.com
 pvallen@thelen.com
 ray.welch@navigantconsulting.com
 spauker@wsgr.com
 jwmctarnaghan@duanemorris.com
 rreinhard@mofo.com
 cem@newsdata.com
 arno@recurrentenergy.com
 hgolub@nixonpeabody.com
 jscancarelli@flk.com
 jwiedman@goodinmacbride.com
 mmattes@nossaman.com
 bwetstone@hotmail.com
 jen@cnt.org
 lisa_weinzimer@platts.com
 steven@moss.net
 sellis@fypower.org
 ELL5@pge.com
 GXL2@pge.com
 jxa2@pge.com
 JDF1@PGE.COM
 RHHJ@pge.com
 sscb@pge.com
 SEHC@pge.com

sv6@pge.com
 S1L7@pge.com
 vjw3@pge.com
 karla.dailey@cityofpaloalto.org
 farrokh.albuyeh@oati.net
 dtibbs@aes4u.com
 jhahn@covantaenergy.com
 andy.vanhorn@vhcenergy.com
 Joe.paul@dynegy.com
 info@calseia.org
 gblue@enxco.com
 sbeserra@sbcglobal.net
 monica.schwebs@bingham.com
 phanschen@mofo.com
 wbooth@booth-law.com
 josephhenri@hotmail.com
 pthompson@summitblue.com
 dietrichlaw2@earthlink.net
 alex.kang@itron.com
 Betty.Seto@kema.com
 JerryL@abag.ca.gov
 jody_london_consulting@earthlink.net
 steve@schiller.com
 mrw@mrwassoc.com
 rschmidt@bartlells.com
 adamb@greenlining.org
 stevek@kromer.com
 clyde.murley@comcast.net
 brenda.lemay@horizonwind.com
 carla.peterman@gmail.com
 elvine@lbl.gov
 rhwiser@lbl.gov
 C_Marnay@lbl.gov
 philm@scedenergy.com
 rita@ritanortonconsulting.com
 cpechman@powereconomics.com
 emahlon@ecoact.org
 richards@mid.org
 rogerv@mid.org
 tomk@mid.org
 fwmonier@tid.org
 brbarkovich@earthlink.net
 johnredding@earthlink.net
 clark.bernier@rlw.com
 rmccann@umich.edu
 cmkehrein@ems-ca.com
 grosenblum@caiso.com
 mgillette@enernoc.com
 rsmutny-jones@caiso.com
 saeed.farrokhpay@ferc.gov
 e-recipient@caiso.com

david@branchcomb.com
 kenneth.swain@navigantconsulting.com
 kdusel@navigantconsulting.com
 gpickering@navigantconsulting.com
 lpark@navigantconsulting.com
 davidreynolds@ncpa.com
 scott.tomashefsky@ncpa.com
 ewolfe@resero.com
 Audra.Hartmann@Dynergy.com
 Bob.lucas@calobby.com
 curt.barry@iwpnews.com
 danskopec@gmail.com
 dseperas@calpine.com
 dave@ppallc.com
 dkk@eslawfirm.com
 wyne@braunlegal.com
 kgough@calpine.com
 kelli.smith@sen.ca.gov
 kdw@woodruff-expert-services.com
 mwaugh@arb.ca.gov
 pbarthol@energy.state.ca.us
 pstoner@lgc.org
 rachel@ceert.org
 bernardo@braunlegal.com
 steven@lipmanconsulting.com
 steven@iepa.com
 wtasat@arb.ca.gov
 lmh@eslawfirm.com
 etiedemann@kmtg.com
 ltenhope@energy.state.ca.us
 bushinsky@pewclimate.org
 obartha@smud.org
 bbeebe@smud.org
 bpurewal@water.ca.gov
 dmacmull@water.ca.gov
 kmills@cfbf.com
 karen@klinh.com
 ehadley@reupower.com
 sas@a-klaw.com
 egw@a-klaw.com
 akelly@climatetrust.org
 alan.comnes@nrgenergy.com
 kyle.silon@ecosecurities.com
 californiadockets@pacificorp.com
 Philip.H.Carver@state.or.us
 samuel.r.sadler@state.or.us
 lisa.c.schwartz@state.or.us
 cbreidenich@yahoo.com
 dws@r-c-s-inc.com
 jesus.arredondo@nrgenergy.com
 charlie.blair@delta-ee.com

Tom.Elgie@powerex.com
 clarence.binninger@doj.ca.gov
 david.zonana@doj.ca.gov
 ayk@cpuc.ca.gov
 agc@cpuc.ca.gov
 aeg@cpuc.ca.gov
 blm@cpuc.ca.gov
 bbc@cpuc.ca.gov
 cf1@cpuc.ca.gov
 cft@cpuc.ca.gov
 tam@cpuc.ca.gov
 dsh@cpuc.ca.gov
 edm@cpuc.ca.gov
 eks@cpuc.ca.gov
 cpe@cpuc.ca.gov
 hym@cpuc.ca.gov
 jm3@cpuc.ca.gov
 jnm@cpuc.ca.gov
 jbf@cpuc.ca.gov
 jk1@cpuc.ca.gov
 jst@cpuc.ca.gov
 jtp@cpuc.ca.gov
 jol@cpuc.ca.gov
 jci@cpuc.ca.gov
 jf2@cpuc.ca.gov
 krd@cpuc.ca.gov
 lrm@cpuc.ca.gov
 ltt@cpuc.ca.gov
 mjd@cpuc.ca.gov
 ner@cpuc.ca.gov
 pw1@cpuc.ca.gov
 psp@cpuc.ca.gov
 pzs@cpuc.ca.gov
 rmm@cpuc.ca.gov
 ram@cpuc.ca.gov
 smk@cpuc.ca.gov
 sgm@cpuc.ca.gov
 svn@cpuc.ca.gov
 scr@cpuc.ca.gov
 tcx@cpuc.ca.gov
 ken.alex@doj.ca.gov
 ken.alex@doj.ca.gov
 jsanders@caiso.com
 jgill@caiso.com
 ppettingill@caiso.com
 mscheibl@arb.ca.gov
 gcollord@arb.ca.gov
 jdoll@arb.ca.gov
 pburmich@arb.ca.gov
 bblevins@energy.state.ca.us
 dmetz@energy.state.ca.us

deborah.slom@doj.ca.gov
 dks@cpuc.ca.gov
 kgriffin@energy.state.ca.us
 ldecarlo@energy.state.ca.us
 mpryor@energy.state.ca.us
 mgarcia@arb.ca.gov
 pduvair@energy.state.ca.us
 wsm@cpuc.ca.gov
 ntronaas@energy.state.ca.us
 hurlock@water.ca.gov
 hronin@water.ca.gov
 miller@energy.state.ca.us